REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested since no new issues are raised by entry of the Amendment and the Amendment places the Application in condition for allowance, or at least in better form for appeal.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-9 were rejected as allegedly being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicants have amended the claims in view of the Examiner's rejection. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Philbrick et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0037406). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in part, a network-storage apparatus for high-speed streaming data transmission that includes a TOE for reading data to be transmitted to the network from the peripheral memory, constructing the data in the form of a packet including information for network transmission, transmitting the packet to the network, and storing the data received from the network in the peripheral memory through the peripheral memory controller, wherein the network storage apparatus stores the streaming data received through network on the disk storage in the form of zero copy and transmits the streaming data stored on the disk through the network in the form of zero copy, between the plurality of disk storage of an internet server computer system and a network.

In contrast, Philbrick relates to an intelligent network storage interface. The Examiner alleges that that the sequencer 52 is analogous to the TOE recited in claim 1. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The sequencer 52 in Philbrick processes incoming data to validate the data and create a summary or descriptor of the data. Philbrick does not teach or suggest that the sequencer reads data to be transmitted to the network, as recited in claim 1. Philbrick merely teaches processing of incoming packets, not the outgoing packets.

Furthermore, because Philbrick does not teach reading data to be transmitted to the network, Philbrick also fails to teach or suggest that the data is read from a peripheral memory, as recited in claim 1. See, for example, paragraph [0048]. Therefore, since the sequencer 52 is not involved with constructing outgoing messages, but rather only analyze incoming network messages, Philbrick fails to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 1.

Additionally, Philbrick discloses a local processor 44, but in the present invention, there is no local processor. The processor 44 in Philbrick is required because it implements packet transmission, however, in the present invention, the TOE transmits the packets so there is no need for a processor.

Additionally, the INIC memory 46 disclosed in Figure 1 of Philbrick is a type of frame buffer without a lot of memory. The memory 46 cannot transmit a plurality of data in the form of zero copy, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the memory 46 in Philbrick cannot read data in storage, transmit it without interferance of a CPU directly to the network and the plurality of data cannot be transmitted in the form of zero copy, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, Philbrick fails to teach, or even suggest, a network-storage apparatus for high-speed streaming data transmission that includes a TOE for reading data to be transmitted to the network from the peripheral memory, constructing the data in the form of a packet including information for network transmission, transmitting the packet to the network, and storing the data received from the network in the peripheral memory through the peripheral memory controller, wherein the network storage apparatus stores the streaming data received through network on the disk storage in the form of zero copy and transmits the streaming data stored on the disk through the network in the form of zero copy, between the plurality of disk storage of an internet server computer system and a network, as recited in claim 1.

Claims 2-9 are believed allowable for at least the same reasons presented above with respect to claim 1 by virtue of their dependence upon claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection

Conclusion

Therefore, all objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney for Applicants at the telephone number indicated below in order to expeditiously resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

MAYER BROWN ROWE & MAW LLP

By: _____
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307
Direct No. (202) 263-3280

YSH/VVK

Intellectual Property Group
1909 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006-1101
(202) 263-3000 Telephone
(202) 263-3300 Facsimile

Date: May 21, 2006